UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,230	06/08/2001	Vaughn E. Keenan	04694.00073	6194

27160 7590 09/23/2004

PATENT ADMINSTRATOR
KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
525 WEST MONROE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693

EXAMINER	
WILSON, JACQUELINE B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2612	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/876,230	KEENAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacqueline Wilson	2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 August 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-78* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *42-50,56-61 and 68-78* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,14-20,23-26,51,52,62-64,66 and 67* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3-13,21,22,27-41,53-55 and 65* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *08/27/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Please see rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. (US 4,831,455) and Umeda et al. (US 5,920,342).

Regarding Claim 1, Ishikawa et al teaches a generally horizontally extending boom assembly (fig. 2, element 3), the boom assembly being positioned above a target area (1), at least one camera (2) mounted on the boom assembly at a location spaced from the plane of the target area, the at least one camera being oriented so that the field of view thereof encompasses the target area (see fig. 2), and a controller (shown in fig. 10) in communication with the at least one camera, the controller receiving image data from the at least one camera (126). However, Ishikawa et al fails to specifically disclose the at least one camera is a digital camera and the controller processes the image data to form a digital image of the target area. Digital cameras are

notoriously well known in the art and would have been obvious to use a digital camera in this system for use with an electronic screen for providing optimum resolution of the image. Also using digital cameras provide easier processing of the image especially for transmitting images in video and data conferencing. Umeda et al teaches an electronic camera (fig. 7A) with a controller (referred to as a PC card 14 and personal computer 16; col. 5, lines 46+) in communication with the at least one digital camera and processing the image data to form a digital image of the target area (fig. 8, 22). The controller is advantageous in the device to further process (as shown in fig. 7A) the image data before transmission to the computer (16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use a digital camera and include a controller for processing the image data for the purpose of generating quality images.

Regarding Claim 2, Ishikawa et al teaches the boom assembly is positioned above the midpoint of the target area (see fig 1).

Regarding Claim 14, Ishikawa et al teaches a controller but fails to specifically disclose the controller is coupled to a computer network. However, Umeda et al teaches a controller (16) is coupled to a computer network (referred to as Ethernet; col. 15, lines 5-16). Ethernet is a local area network in with users at remote locations can receive information for viewing. Although Umeda et al does not specifically disclose the controller (16) uses remote viewing resources of the computer network, it is inherent that an Ethernet (LAN) is used to share information between users. In this case, it the information would be the documents being captured. Therefore, it would have obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the controller coupled to a computer network and use resources of the computer network.

Claim 15 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 14. (See rejection of Claim 14 above.)

4. Claims 16-20, 23-26, 51,52,62-64, 66, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al, Umeda et al, in view of Kuno (US 6,567,121).

Regarding Claim 16, neither Ishikawa et al nor Umeda et al specifically teaches the controller has Internet server capabilities and is coupled to a distributed computer network to allow the digital image to be accessed by a user through an Internet browser. However, Kuno teaches a controller (fig. 1) that has Internet server capabilities (through communication interface 7; col. 3, lines 20+) and is coupled to a distributed computer network to allow digital images to be accessed by a user through an Internet browser (col. 3, lines 23+; see also fig. 7). This gives remote users the ability to view images without being in the vicinity of the object. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the controller to have Internet sever capabilities and is coupled to a distributed computer network to allow the digital image to be accessed by a user through an Internet browser.

Claims 17 and 18 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1, wherein the dedicated appliance is a personal computer. (See rejection of Claim 1 above.)

Regarding Claim 19, Ishikawa et al fails to specifically teach the controller sends digital image to a designated secondary storage location in the distributed computer network. However Kuna teaches that image data is sent to a network for Internet usage. One having ordinary skill would recognize that a remote computer system, or the like, would obviously be involved to

receive the images. Therefore, a storage location would, at the remote location, also be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art such that the user at the remote location may save, edit, print, etc, the received information at any desired time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a designated secondary storage location in the distributed computer network.

Regarding Claim 20, Ishikawa et al teaches the controller includes a display to present the digital image (fig. 10, element 5).

Claim 23 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 1 and 16. (See rejection of Claims 1 and 16 above.)

Claim 24 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 14, where "publishes said digital image" is the information from the controller which distributes the information via Ethernet. (See rejection of Claim 14 above.)

Claim 25 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

Regarding Claim 26, Ishikawa et al fails to specifically teach the controller processes image data received from the at least one digital camera to reduce the size of the digital image. However, Umeda et al teaches the controller performs data compression on the received image data (col. 10, lines 37+). Compressing image data reduces the size of the digital image. This is done for the purpose of either transmitting data over a communications line, or for storage on a hard disk, magneto-optical disk, or the like (col. 10, lines 37-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Ishikawa et al to include the controller to process the image data to reduce the size of the digital image.

Claim 51 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 1 and 16. (See rejections of Claims 1 and 16 above.)

Claim 52 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

Claim 62 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 1 and 16, wherein the vertical surface is shown in Ishikawa et al figure 2, element 17. (See rejections of Claims 1 and 16 above.)

Claim 63 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 16, wherein Umeda teaches the camera server has a web address as disclosed in col. 6, lines 5+. (See rejection of Claim 16 above.)

Regarding Claim 64, Ishikawa et al teaches a mount that is configured to be secure to the surface (col. 4, lines 65- col. 5, line 60).

Claim 66 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1. (See rejection of Claim 1 above)

Regarding Claim 67, Ishikawa et al teaches a controller having a first button actuable by an operator to cause the controller to condition the imaging device to acquire an image (fig. 2, 6a; col. 8, lines 1-7). However, Ishikawa et al fails to specifically disclose a second button actuable to by an operator to cause the controller to post the acquired image to the site. However, Kuno teaches storing images in a server (see fig. 3). When a client wants to view images, the client must request the images in accordance with a predetermined format (col. 7, lines 15+; see also fig. 5). In order for the images to accessible to other users, an instruction to post the images is an obvious feature of the device. The permit others to view images captured

at the local site using the Internet. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include a second button actuable by an operator to cause the controller to post the acquired image to the site.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-13, 21-22, 27-31, 53-55 and 65 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding Claim 3, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests a generally horizontal extending boom assembly, the boom assembly being position above a target area, at least one digital camera mounted on the boom assembly, and a controller in communication with the at least one digital camera, as claimed in Claim 1, wherein **the boom assembly has a length of from about 30 to 50 inches**.

Regarding Claim 21, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggest a system for capturing images of a target area comprising a generally horizontally extending boom assembly, at least one digital camera mounted on the boom assembly, and a controller in communication with the at least one digital camera, as claimed in claim 1, wherein the controller has Internet server capabilities and is coupled to a distributed computer network to allow the digital image to be accessed by a user through an Internet browser, and wherein **the controller processes image**

data received from the at least one digital camera to yield high contrast pen strokes on a white or empty background.

Regarding Claim 27, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests a system for capturing images of a target area comprising a boom assembly, at least one digital camera mounted on the boom assembly, and a controller in communication with the at least one digital camera, as claimed in claim 23, wherein the controller automatically publishes the digital image and processes the image data received from the at least one digital camera to reduce the size of the digital image, and wherein **image data is processed to yield high contrast pen strokes on a white or empty background.**

Regarding Claim 31, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests a boom assembly adapted to extend outwardly from a generally vertical surface, at least one digital camera mounted on the boom assembly at a location spaced from the surface, and a controller in communication with the at least one digital camera, as claimed in Claim 23, wherein **the boom assembly includes a wall mount, a boom extending outwardly from the wall mount and a camera head on a distal end of the boom, the camera head supporting the at least one digital camera.**

Regarding Claim 53, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests acquiring an image of a target area that includes information recorded on the target area using an optical recording device, the optical recording device being mounted on a generally horizontal boom positioned above the target area, posting the image to a site in response to user input to allow the image to be accessed by a user through a client browser application, and **processing the image to yield high contrast pen strokes on a white or empty background prior to the posting.**

Regarding Claim 65, the prior art neither teaches nor fairly suggests an arm configured to extend outwardly from a generally vertical surface, an imaging device mounted adjacent a distal end of the arm at a location laterally spaced from the surface, the imaging device being operable to capture an image of an area located below the arm, and a controller in communication with the imaging device, the controller conditioning the imaging device to acquire an image of the area in response to operator input, the controller further posting the acquired image to a site accessible to a user through a web client application in response to operator input, as claimed in Claim 62, wherein **the area comprises a write board mounted on the surface below the arm**.

6. Claims 42-50, 56-61, and 68-78 are allowed.

In response to 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit, no prior art has been found prior to the dates shown in the exhibits.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline Wilson whose telephone number is (703) 308-5080. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm (alternate Fridays off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JBW
09/13/04

AUNG MOE
PRIMARY EXAMINER